DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 130 108 95 CE 008 574

AUTHOR Chenault, JoAnn; Mermis, William L.
TITLE The Professional Education of Human Services Personnel. Monographs on Career Education.
INSTITUTION Office of Career Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 76
NOTE 49p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; Concept Formation; Cooperative Planning; Definitions; Educational Alternatives; Educational Development; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Human Resources; *Human Services; Interagency Cooperation; Learning Experience; *Models; National Programs; Policy Formation; *Professional Education; *Professional Personnel; *Program Development; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Program Planning; Relevance (Education); School Community Cooperation; Teacher Education; Work Experience

ABSTRACT

Commissioned by the Office of Career Education (OCE), this monograph provides a perspective from which the OCE could (1) examine the human services education model implemented by the authors, and (2) consider its possible usefulness in OCE's future planning and development. The focus is on the potential alliance of career education and human services as current national movements which are considered to be organically and systematically interrelated in their basic concepts, purposes, span of concern, and breadth of potential influence on societal change. The authors suggest that if professionals in both areas are to recognize the potential of mutual gains by formal and informal alliances, collaboration, and integration of efforts, both movements will benefit. Conceptual issues in the development of education models for career education personnel are identified and basic questions and issues concerning tradition are addressed. The nature of human services education is discussed, followed by an extensive content model for human services education. This model is discussed in terms of relevance for career education training, differentiating program features, and problems associated with the nature of the program. Concepts of prevention and problems of program development are also discussed. The paper concludes with general recommendations for national planning. (TA)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED130108

MONOGRAPHS ON CAREER EDUCATION

THE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION OF HUMAN SERVICES PERSONNEL

by

JoAnn Chenault
Professor of Education
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville

and

William L. Mermis
Associate Professor of Education
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

January 1976

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
David Mathews, *Secretary*
Virginia Y. Trotter, *Assistant Secretary for Education*

Office of Education
T. H. Bell, Commissioner

CE 008 574

CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLIANCE

Discrimination Prohibited - Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states:

> "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied to benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

Therefore, any program or activity receiving financial assistance from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare must be operated in compliance with this law.

This article was written by JoAnn Chenault and William L. Mermis, in their private capacity. No official support or endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education is intended or should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. Introduction	1
2. Conceptual Issues	1
Basic Questions	2
Issues Concerning Tradition	4
3. The Nature of Human Services Education	8
Content Model for Human Services Education	12
Relevance of Human Services Content for Career Education Training	14
Differentiating Program Features	20
Problems Associated with the Nature of the Program	22
4. Problems of Program Development	23
5. Concepts of Prevention in Program Development	34
6. Recommendations for National Planning	37

1. INTRODUCTION

Having developed a conceptual base for career education as a professional field, a national movement, and a Federal thrust, the Office of Career Education (OCE) is now in the process of determining how it might best exercise national leadership in the development of education programs for career education personnel. This monograph was commissioned to provide a perspective from which that Office could 1) examine the human services education model implemented by the authors, and 2) consider its possible usefulness in OCE's future planning and development.

Earlier writings of OCE's Director Hoyt recognized that "career education is very much a part of the human services movement that allows for a coordinated effort extending over all age levels, geographic settings, and societal institutions."[1] A recent monograph[2] elaborates on this perspective.

There is no doubt about it: Career education and human services, as current national movements, have a highly unusual brotherhood. These movements are organically and systematically interrelated in their basic concepts, purposes, span of concern, and breadth of their potential influence upon societal change. If professionals in both areas are able to recognize the potential of mutual gains by formal and informal alliances, collaboration, and integration of efforts, both movements will benefit.

Since this potential alliance has just begun, we hope the reader will use his/her own experiences and originality as this monograph is read, in the hope that new ideas will evolve. We have made no attempt to draw highly specific conclusions. Rather, our purpose is to present a general perspective calculated to touch the imagination of professionals in both career education and human services.

2. CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

At this stage in the development of education programs for career education personnel, it seems premature and unwise to follow or propose models that presume the resolution of important issues before they have been identified and have had the benefit of professional discussion on a broader national basis.

With this in mind we have identified those issues that seem to be most crucial to the development of education-models for career education personnel. These issues could be used as the basis for such discussions.

Basic Questions

Before we can legitimately engage in national planning and development of career education programs, it seems to us the following basic questions must be addressed and answered.

1. Who "owns" career education?

   a. Is it an area of specialization (primarily) within one academic field? (Is it a part of guidance and counseling, vocational education, business education, social work, special education, teacher education, the general field of education, sociology, psychology, business administration?)

   b. Is it a specialization within many fields? (Some or all of the above and/or other fields?)

   c. Is it an area of specialization within one or more non-academic systems? (Is it a part of manpower/employment, mental health, business/industry, corrections, public aid, etc.?)

   d. Is it an area of specialization within many community systems?

   e. Is it a professional field, per se? (Does it have identifiable components or concepts that influence and shape the process of change within the fields or systems of which it is a part, or do those fields and systems tend to define and shape the direction of career education as it operates within the systems of which it is a part?)

   f. Is it a part of the broader human services movement, involving many fields and systems? If so, what is the nature of this relationship? Is career education a field within the human services field, a component of the field, a field that incorporates or uses other fields, or something else?

2. How can the responsibility for career education be exercised?

   a. If career education should be a field unto itself, how is it to be effectively integrated into other fields and systems?

b. If it should be a part of many fields and systems, how is it to maintain an identity across systems that will allow for influence to move into and change those systems?

c. If it is a part of the national human services movement, how will this integration become recognized, accepted, and more formalized by already practicing career education professionals and by human services professionals? (How can this marriage be legitimized?)

3. What personnel should "do" career education?

   a. Should there be career education "specialists", should other specialists deliver career education, or are there other possibilities?

   b. What systems should employ personnel who deliver career education?

   c. What are the various job roles and functions of career education personnel if they are to be specialists? If they are not to be specialists, how are career education job roles and functions integrated into other jobs?

   d. What experience and training, if any, should be required of those who "do" career education?

4. What should be the general nature of education for career education personnel?

   a. At what levels of training should the education of career education personnel occur?

      1) pre-service, in-service, continuing education?
      2) paraprofessional, community college certificate programs, associate degree programs, baccalaureate, masters, doctoral, post-doctoral?

   b. How extensive should the training be?

   c. Should the education be an integral part of other education programs, specialized career education programs or other?

   d. What are the essential (necessary and sufficient) content areas of knowledge and skills?

   e. Should there be professional accreditation or other methods of quality control for the education of career education personnel?

5. Who should be the educators of career education personnel?

   a. Faculty of one academic field of higher education? Of interdisciplinary higher education fields? Of multidisciplinary programs?

   b. Personnel of one or more community systems? Of inter-systems programs?

   c. If the education should be delivered by one or more fields or systems, how are the legitimate concerns of other systems to be taken into account?

   d. If the education should be delivered by joint or collaborative programs involving many systems and fields, how will such program development occur? What models of program development will be used?

6. What is career education?

A sound conceptual base should guide the answers to the above questions as well as to questions regarding the delivery of career education wherever it will occur. Can the Office of Career Education Position Paper provide that base? Are any changes necessary?

Issues Concerning Tradition

The human services movement places the tradition of all community systems under scrutiny within a perspective that examines those traditions in the light of today's changing realities. The "way it has always been" is no longer accepted without question in any community system that considers itself a part of this contemporary movement.

In order to place under this scrutiny the traditional education of personnel in community systems, we can examine our reliance upon colleges and universities where the almost exclusive responsibility for education has occurred in the past. Even in-service education within community systems has relied heavily upon university personnel and/or university continuing education programs.

Lately, community human services administrators and boards have begun to judge master's and doctoral degree graduates as often elitist, arrogant, and naive about their work and the realities of the community. Human services systems are looking for different kinds of personnel than those who have come through traditional training programs.

Of the number of reasons for the tradition of university/college training programs, four bear closer examination. Against the backdrop of the human services movement, these four traditions can be viewed in another light. Following each tradition listed below are some alternatives to the continuance of the tradition. These alternatives suggest that we need not dig our heads deeper in the sands when there are other ways to proceed in the changing world we live in.

TRADITION I. Universities have been able to award credit toward academic degrees, an incentive for human services employees to enter and continue training programs. Human service systems have rewarded university education by incorporating the criteria of university degrees and credits in the determination of a) personnel selection, b) salary increases, and c) promotions.

Alternatives

a. Federal and State agencies as well as all other community systems can monitor and influence the quality of university programs in a number of ways; e.g., 1) they can give higher priority in selection, salary, and promotions to personnel who attend or graduate from community-associated university programs - programs that have been developed in collaboration with community systems; 2) they can tie their acceptance of university intern, practicum, and volunteer students to the system's participation in various aspects of the university training programs. (They can require a reconception of the mutual benefits that should accrue from training programs.)

b. Completion of other kinds of non-university programs may be included as legitimate criteria for selection, salary, and promotions; e.g., specially designed programs by other qualified groups and organizations.

c. Degrees and credits of various kinds can be provided through contemporary organizations outside the university, such as profit and nonprofit institutes, centers, corporations, and other groups.

TRADITION II. Professional sanctions (accreditation of programs and personnel, and membership in professional organizations) are largely dependent upon university degrees. Human services professionals are university-trained and naturally tend to assume that their own training (which qualified them for professional status) should be required also of new members of the professions. The course of traditional professional education is not unlike the rituals required for initiation into fraternities:

the passing on of the obstacles one endures to those who follow. A further tie to universities is through human services professionals who either work in university programs or are affiliated in various economically rewarding ways with universities.

Alternatives

a. Professionals may be required to give up the assumption that the only programs of quality are those "like" programs from which they graduated.

b. Professional organizations may be pressed—if they are to maintain the confidence of the public—to sanction other kinds of quality training programs; e.g., those utilizing faculty from across fields and systems, some highly skilled practitioners who are not faculty, and some professionals who offer their services through nonuniversity mechanisms.

TRADITION III. Universities have a larger number of academically trained professionals whose work assignments lie primarily in education programs. Whether the issue is economic constraints or quality of training, community systems, with some exceptions, have not chosen or been able to develop nationally legitimized education programs within their own systems.

Alternatives

a. In accordance with contemporary human services directions, community systems can combine their resources and expertise to develop collaborative education programs that are mutually beneficial to those systems participating.

b. Human service systems can influence university education programs more directly and forcefully by joining other systems in collaborative efforts to move those programs into more contemporary directions.

c. Human service systems can inventory their own potential value to universities in these times of austerity in higher education and bargain more effectively in collaborative programs where they formerly felt the university was doing them a favor to share its expertise with the community.

TRADITION IV. Organizational processes in the universities have been more amenable to providing education programs than have other community systems whose purposes in the past have been primarily the direct delivery of services.

Alternatives

a. Those organizational processes which in the past made university programs more efficient for providing education are the same processes that now paralyze and prevent quality education for human services personnel. The university is organized along competitive, departmental lines that make any real interdisciplinary or collaborative programming nearly impossible. Human service systems can recognize the university's present inability to respond to contemporary needs and look to more appropriate sources for training.

b. Human service systems that communicate their needs more clearly and forcefully to universities can influence more immediate and responsive reaction from them.

Having set the stage with some conceptual questions about career education training and some issues about traditional professional education, we turn now to a consideration of professional education in human services. As we have said, the human services movement and the career education movement have potentially important contributions to make to one another. And we believe our particular education model may be useful to career education in its future planning and development of education programs for career education personnel.

The relationship of the remaining discussion to the education of career education personnel is an implicit assumption, and we hope readers will be able to discern relationships to particular aspects of their own work and specific needs. However, we have drawn frequent direct relationships to career education throughout the monograph in order to ensure that career education professionals are reading from the perspective of the question: How can these ideas be useful to us in planning and implementing professional education programs for career education personnel?

We have used as the frame of reference our own experience in the development of human services graduate education at Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville. We have tried to include a broad range of developmental experiences including organizational issues and problems, because we believe career education professionals may experience some, if not most, of these or similar problems.

3. THE NATURE OF HUMAN SERVICES EDUCATION

Human services education, in one sense, is as old as training programs that prepare teachers, lawyers, doctors, social workers, counselors, and other professionals who work in the "human" services. However, the contemporary meaning of "human services" applies to those elements that characterize the national human service movement. We propose a new definition of human services education in its contemporary context: Those programs that contribute to the education of human services personnel through learning experiences and subject content that are integrated *across* academic fields and *across* community systems. Our use of the term *human services education* refers to this cross-fields integration and not to the historical single-field education programs.

In order to provide some specific referents to the nature of human services education programs, we have included some characteristics of the Organic Model[3] as demonstrated by the Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville graduate program.[4] By reading through these general program characteristics, career education professionals can draw their own conclusions about the degree to which various Organic Model concepts may be applicable and useful in Federal and local planning for career education programs for professional education.

1. Generalist-Specialist Components

   The nature of generalist and specialist components of the human services graduate program may differ for each student in relation to his background, competencies, and career goals. The generalist preparation is intended to improve the general quality of help-giving in human services, but the generalist curriculum contains "specific" subject matter content. Graduates are expected to have a broad perspective of the network of community systems and their relationships and interdependencies. They also have knowledge and competencies in those professional/academic content areas that characterize the human services movement (see Content Model in Section 3).

   In addition, the generalist component serves five "career" purposes:

   a. To increase job mobility *across* systems

   b. To increase upward mobility *within* systems

   c. To increase job mobility across *communities*

d. To increase qualifications to compete in job market entry

e. To increase professional competency in present jobs.

Specialized competencies may be in areas that are not the equivalent of courses, but represent learning that cuts across courses linearly and enters horizontally within courses according to the special needs and interests of students.

2. The Work Experience Concept

The second major characteristic is a field experience that differs in important ways from other graduate programs across the country. First, work experience in the community is an integral part of each quarter's work for every student. Work experience is not a curricular "unit" (in traditional programs, it is often the last "class", and is sometimes simulated experience). Instead, it is the continuing basis for all learning in the degree program. Those students who are unemployed or who need field experience outside their own agency or program utilize an individualized field system developed especially to meet this need.[5]

Another aspect of the work experience concept concerns the nature and quality of the experience. All work experiences are planned, negotiated, and carried out with the approval of the advisory committee, insuring coordination within the total program. The integration of work experience into the student's classroom curriculum is an added assurance of quality, preventing the isolation of experiences from evaluation, study, and continuing improvement.

Very often, the contact personnel within human service systems in the community are, themselves, students in the program. In a number of instances, "contracts" between the university and community agencies regarding work experience occur as a part of the curriculum itself. That is, the human services contact person and contracting student are often students in the same classes, the negotiations and work experience being a real part of class discussions and projects, and thereby subject to study and evaluation within the class.

Work experiences with persons of varying age groups and settings help the student learn to adapt to varying conditions. They also help the student to regard the recipient of his services as a person rather than as "client," "delinquent," "patient," "student," "aged," "deprived," or "black."

3. Individualized Programming

The Human Services Program is not a list of prescribed courses that students must take. With the exception of certain general requirements, student programs are developed by the student, with the approval of his advisory committee, taking into account his previous training and experience, special interests, competencies, and career goals. Individualized programming is a somewhat complex personal and professional learning experience and should not be confused with traditional academic advisement which often involves little more than selection of courses.

4. The Organic Community Concept

The Organic Community Concept is described in more detail in the Chenault book.[6] It is important to understand that "the community" is not a collection of persons and systems outside the university, nor the university a collection of persons and systems outside the community. The Organic Community conceptualizes students, faculty, human services personnel, recipients of human services, and all community citizens as "the community". It conceptualizes as part of the community the university, university departments and units, community agencies, State and Federal programs, and all community systems and groups.

The Organic Community concept attempts to facilitate the collaborative efforts of all community systems and people toward the improvement of life in the community, thereby making the curriculum a real part of the community processes. Such a community concept presumes that systematic linking of all parts of the community mentioned above will be a continuing process and a part of the education program. That is, students in the graduate program, insofar as it has been possible, have worked collaboratively with people across many community systems, and these interfaces are a part of the program curriculum.

It is expected that such linkages will continue after the student's graduation. There are now graduates of the master's human services program who, by virtue of their university contacts, are working collaboratively with one another across systems in the community. The program, in a sense, creates a continuing network of linkages beneficial to the student personally, to his system of employment, and to the community in general.

Human services activities that occur within the Organic Community are difficult to describe because each activity is unique and the interrelationships among activities are complex. It is estimated that each student in the program has been involved in one or two community activities during the course of his program. It is a realistic and conservative estimate that over the period of one academic year, 50 to 75 such activities take place. To the degree that they are successful, the communities surrounding and served by the university stand to gain a good deal in the delivery of human services. One of the advantages of unifying community activities and the curriculum is that all community members involved have the opportunity to evaluate and learn from their failures.

5. The Human Services Center

The organizational structure out of which this program evolved was the Human Services Center. The Center Model, described in the Chenault book,[7] is technically not an academic unit. It contains no courses, no teaching faculty, and generates no credit hours (for itself). It serves as an administrative mechanism allowing interdepartmental and interdisciplinary activities to operate noncompetitively. The Center's purpose is to facilitate the continuing development of human services activities as a university effort rather than as a departmental or combined-department operation.

6. Heterogeneity and Breadth

A reasonably balanced heterogeneity provides the opportunity for sharing of knowledge and special competencies among students and builds a broad perspective of community systems. Employers of human services personnel extend across a wide range of community systems. We have included a list of some of the broad systems employing human services personnel to illustrate how important it would be for them to have an understanding of career education concepts and practices, as well as some ideas about career education program development within their systems. It can also be seen how important it is for career education personnel to have a broad human services education.

Public and private schools
Vocational and technical schools
Higher education
Community colleges
Churches and religious organizations
State Departments of Mental Health

Hospitals, nursing schools
Health maintenance organizations
Nursing homes
Allied health fields
Mental health centers and clinics
Children and Family Services
Public aid programs
Social welfare agencies
Shelter care homes
Business and industry
Youth services bureaus
Employment services
Rehabilitation agencies
Legal services, courts
Recreation programs
Community education programs
Multiservice centers
Detention homes, half-way houses
Probation, delinquency programs
Alcoholism, drug abuse programs
Crisis intervention and outreach programs
Veterans programs
City, county, Federal Government
Transportation and communication
Urban planning and development
Human resources programs
Environmental protection agencies
Geriatric programs, senior citizens
Law enforcement
Public health
Manpower programs

Content Model for Human Services Education

Ideally, the content of human services training programs would follow nontraditional models inasmuch as traditional subject matter components in professional training programs are inappropriate for the purposes of human services education. It is, of course, an exaggeration to suggest that traditional professional training programs could be validly described with a single generalization; nevertheless, we believe most readers will recognize the

following characteristics in the majority of graduate programs they know about in the various professional fields. These represent tradition:

1. Some required "foundation" courses in academic disciplines (e.g., sociology, psychology, education, humanities).

   Generally this background is acquired through individual courses offered in academic departments outside the department of the professional major and ordinarily the courses are survey or overview courses of a broad area. More specialized courses are normally restricted through prerequisites to majors in the discipline concerned.

2. Some required courses in the basic theory, philosophy, or concepts of the general professional area (e.g., basic principles of social work, counseling theory, introduction to urban studies).

   These courses sometimes are open to non-majors as electives, but are nearly always prerequisite to the more specialized courses in the field.

3. Some courses on a higher level of specialization within the professional field (e.g., epidemiology, group therapy, seminar in bureaucracy).

4. Some competency or skills courses relating to the practice of the profession (e.g., information systems design, communications skills, data processing).

5. Some research courses.

6. Supervised practice or internship.

7. Some electives that provide for either a) increased specialization or b) broadening of background in related subject areas.

We propose that human services education must differ from this tradition in a number of important ways. In the tradition of professional training, the what-it-is courses are separate from and prerequisite to the how-to-do-it courses, and both are separate from and prerequisite to the doing-it courses.

While it is not literally possible to accomplish all learning simultaneously, we believe the most effective human services education would provide for more concurrent learning than presently exists within the tradition. There is evidence from our own program that students can read and discuss what-it-is subject matter during the same day or week that they read and discuss how-to-do-it; and during that same time period, they can engage in doing-it. We have also found that the student interest in the what-it-is and how-to-do-it aspects of

learning are greatly increased when the doing-it aspect accompanies the former. We have also found that simulation does not qualify as doing-it.

It is with some reluctance that we have set down some possible content areas for human services education. The reluctance comes from the fear that future human service programs would simply translate these areas into course titles and deliver the same traditional education with fancy new course titles. The biggest danger from a consumer point of view is the long history and skill of some university-types to massage their academic rhetoric in order to secure both funding and customers. These program developers then proceed to sell the same programmatic product using a contemporary sex-appeal language system.

It is our hope that these subject areas would not become isolated, uncoordinated, fragmented, class-by-class subjects. However, we do understand that most of us are limited by our own institution's traditions and rules; and our programs sometimes must be squeezed into historic structures that are less than ideal for our purposes. With this in mind, the following model is suggested for discussion purposes or for experimental programs. Of course, this classification represents only the beginning phase in the process of our own thinking.

Relevance of Human Services Content for Career Education Training

A few brief comments regarding each content area will help to illustrate the relationship between human services and career education content and will suggest the relevance of this subject matter to career education.

1. Community Systems

   We believe that one of the reasons career education as a national movement has not permeated the community as a coordinated effort is the assumption held by so many people (including career education professionals in the field) that career education belongs to educational systems only, or at least that it must originate and be managed from within educational institutions.

   It seems essential that future professionals must gain a perspective of the community as a potentially integrated and coordinated network of systems. We believe the frame of reference limiting career education to educational institutions will not change significantly until the training of its professionals includes learning in areas other than the field of education - learning that creates a *community* frame of reference rather than a *school* frame of reference.

CONTENT MODEL FOR HUMAN SERVICES EDUCATION[8]

The Community	*Change Processes*	*Help-giving*
Community Systems	Systems Theories & Concepts	Principles of Prevention
Human Service Systems	Organizational Change	Support Systems
Community Development	Program Planning & Development	Crisis Intervention
Community Organization	Program Evaluation	Consultation
Community Mental Health & Related Systems	Program Management & Administration	Interpersonal/ Human Relations
	Citizen Action & Change	
	Legal Aspects of Human Services	

Explanation

The *Community* column could be said to represent the general background or broader foundations for specialized learning (What-it-is-aspects).

Both *Change Processes* and *Help-giving* columns represent means-oriented areas. Change Processes refer, in general, to organizations and systems change from the perspective of the organization as a whole. Help-giving refers to various levels of change (macro to micro reading from top down). Those near the top are more closely related to column 2 and those near the bottom are more closely related to the perspective of the individual delivering direct service.

2. Human Services Systems

Just knowing what is "out there" in the community is not enough. Until career education professionals have a more intimate understanding of the purposes and inner workings of human services (as well as their potential as an integrated network), they will never understand the vast potential of career education in all community systems, and will never be able to develop new programs that actualize this potential.

3. Community Development and Community Organization

Some specialized knowledge relating to models and practices of community change is essential for career education practitioners in order for them to be a part of these processes, rather than outsiders seeking to "sell" their ideas to other systems.

4. Community Mental Health and Related Systems

The field of community mental health is given special emphasis for a number of reasons: a) Nearly every human services concept is incorporated within its professional literature; b) Its contribution to the field (along with public health and public administration) is greater than other systems; c) Its national directions best illustrate the directions of human services as a movement; d) The history of the development of community mental health is an interesting example of national change - including failures and inadequacies - that relates to human services concepts; and e) The subject matter is an integral part of all human services.

5. Systems Theories and Concepts

The integration of career education into all community systems will require more than the handing over of career education packages with the message, "Here it is; now you do it". Models for linkage, integration, and coordination will have to be worked out by career education professionals in cooperation with personnel in other systems. This collaborative working together will require knowledge of and experience in general systems, ecological, and organic concepts.

6. Organizational Change and Maintenance

In the recent experience of one of the authors with the Office of Career Education proposals for demonstration projects, the two most serious limitations, in her opinion, were the lack of understanding and consideration of program development and organizational development on the part

of program proposers. The success of career education as a national movement is going to depend almost totally upon the ability of career education professionals to develop *programs that will make a difference.* And until organizational change becomes a part of their professional training, we are not sure how realistic it is to expect any significant national change.

7. Program Planning and Development

Organizational change is, of course, really one important aspect of the broader area of program planning and development. One impression from reading program proposals in various fields of education is that most professionals who plan and implement programs lack adequate knowledge about a) ways to integrate and coordinate their programs with other units and systems within and outside their organizations, b) models of linking, c) methods of seeking and utilizing input from the consumer (in this case, of career education), d) planning organizational processes, e) their program's relationship to the larger organization, f) conceptualizing administrative and organizational structures and/or processes as a basis of program operations, and g) contemporary models for initiating, developing, and maintaining change processes.

8. Program Evaluation

With few exceptions, the career education professionals who wrote proposals for the Office of Career Education had little conception of contemporary directions in program evaluation. Consequently they conceptualized program evaluation as some kind of isolated and after-the-fact appendage to the program. One of the purposes of organic human services education is to help professionals gain the ability to think simultaneously about program planning, development, evaluation, and management, since they must all fall within a unified model and programmatic process.

9. Citizen Action and Change

We believe that career education programs will be more successful if they place more emphasis upon and share more responsibility with the citizen consumers of career education. The recent programs proposed to the OCE appeared to be based upon the assumption that career education was something a select group of professionals would deliver to or do for the consumer of career education. Until career education professionals can incorporate consumers as participating allies, their programs will be passing up one of the most potent forces of change.

10. Legal Aspects of Human Services

A number of issues in this content area are specifically and directly related to career education, among them, a) the basis of career education programs in Federal legislation, b) the legislative bases of other human service systems and their relationship to career education, c) a general understanding of citizen rights according to law, d) resources and legal options for protecting citizen rights, and e) legal aspects of employee/employer relationships and work in general.

11. Principles of Prevention

Career education can play an important part in the development of models of prevention in human services, especially the systems of community mental health, law enforcement and corrections, employment and manpower, business and industry, welfare, and education. But before career education professionals can create original new models in this area, they must understand the concept (including primary, secondary, and tertiary strategies) as it relates to human services.

12. Development of Support Systems

Career education professionals have the opportunity to contribute imaginative, new input into community support systems of all kinds, as well as to utilize support system concepts in their program development. But of course they must first know something about the work that is going on nationally in this area.

13. Crisis Intervention

Crisis intervention, support systems, prevention, and other content subjects are interrelated areas of knowledge. The meaning of crisis intervention in the human services movement is much more than the direct one-to-one clinical intervention; it is more than the hot-lines, and more than the immediate resolution of single monumental problems. Career education professionals need to have an understanding of these contemporary concepts in order to conceptualize and propose new ways of developmentally entering career education into crisis intervention programs.

14. Consultation

The knowledge of most career education professionals about consultation comes almost exclusively from the literature of counselor

education or education in general. Some professionals are peripherally informed about mental health consultation, but the consultation literature of human services covers a much broader professional literature, including various models and techniques in consultation practice across fields and settings. Career education professionals need to know the meaning and potentiality of consultation across the human services network in order to determine how career education can best utilize this area.

15. Interpersonal/Human Relations

It is in this area where career education professionals tend to have had the greatest learning and experience. And yet even in this area, most counselor education programs are limited to the concepts of guidance, counseling, or psychotherapy as the sole mechanism for help-giving. Organic human services education provides a broader perspective of the subject of help-giving, including professional and paraprofessional, formal and informal, the above four content pieces of help-giving, philosophical and value issues across the helping professions, and the development of personal conceptual bases of help for use by practicing professionals.

The specific content area of *career education*, like human services, would be expected to broaden its perspective to include interrelated knowledge across systems. Thus, the broader perspective of career education would include a general knowledge of the political, social, and economic history of work in the United States, the relationship of the new federalism to career education, other intended new directions of the U.S. Department of HEW, relationships of health, education, and welfare and all other social systems to career education at the local level and in specific programs, and other aspects of human services content mentioned previously in this paper.

What we are saying is that the development of career education training programs should be preceded at the national level by a thoughtful consideration of program content areas. Such a consideration might be made by those having specialized knowledge in career education, some practitioners in Federal or community systems outside education, and human services-trained professionals.

This Human Services Content Model is based upon the assumption that it could be used in a variety of ways, depending upon the circumstances: 1) It can, of course, provide the content for master's and doctoral human services training programs; 2) it can furnish a "foundation" for specialization in such fields as social work, urban planning, public administration, corrections, public health; 3) it can be used as a component part of professional training programs in all areas, being adaptable to baccalaureate, master's, doctoral, or post-doctoral levels.

Its use as a component in teacher-training programs (for example) would differ from its use as a component in programs for master's in public health (MPH). Human services education components in medical schools and law schools would not be the same as in-service workshops for school counselor or mental health personnel; and post-doctoral continuing education for human services professionals would differ from human services components within doctoral programs in specialized professional areas across many fields. And yet, in each case, the Content Model would provide a guide to subject content and experience needs.

In some cases, other special components may be added to the Human Services Content Model. For example, an in-service education package within particular community systems (mental health, corrections, city government, health care systems, etc.) could include subject content from one or more fields to acquaint the trainee with both "general" human services content and "specialized" field content.

There are, obviously, a number of ways that career education training could utilize human services education. It seems to us that career education should not be categorized in the same way that other "field" areas are because career education is, ideally, an integral part of all human service systems. As we see it, the beginning stages of conceptualization and planning for career education professional training would follow one or both of two possibilities.

a. Career education could be included as a curricular component (specialized series of courses, curricular blocks, integrated subject matter in other courses, or some combination) within human services education programs.

b. And/or career education training programs could exist as specialized education programs that would include human services education components or "packages."

Differentiating Program Features

In addition to content differences, there are certain other features of human services education, as we conceptualize and practice it, that differ from traditional graduate programs in professional preparation.

1. The program prepares students for professional work in a variety of community settings.

2. Students are qualified to perform a variety of job functions and roles in human services, making them eligible for a number of positions having different job titles and descriptions.

3. Graduates of the program are not only contemporary professionals, but are also "professionals of the future." In other words, they have acquired both content knowledge and professional skills enabling them to develop new, more contemporary job roles that respond to immediate and long term needs of their systems.

4. Through the employment of human services graduates, community systems have the opportunity to utilize their program development skills. Human services graduates have experience and competencies to evaluate existing programs, recommend improvements, and propose new programs.

5. Students gain a broad perspective across the network of human service systems, making them better able to view the community's problems in terms of the many interrelated factors involved.

6. The program affords the opportunity for students to experience the heterogeneity of "community" within the curriculum through group experiences of people working at many levels and in many different systems.

7. Students specialize in areas of competency that apply across community systems.

8. Work experience is an integral and continuing part of the curriculum.

9. Individualized programming is a part of the student's curriculum in the sense that it involves, rather than the mere selection of courses, an integrated consideration of multiple academic and personal factors.

10. The curriculum involves students, faculty, and community systems and groups in continuing and collaborative efforts.

11. The program encourages continual linking of people with one another across all systems of the community.

12. The subject matter of the curriculum has as its base the real problems encountered by students in their work in the community.

13. The program integrates curriculum/research/service for students, faculty, and other community participants.

14. The program provides for pre-service, in-service, and continuing education.

15. Program elements move student responsibility from rhetoric to reality.

16. The administrative structure is an open system providing for continuing change.

17. The organizational mechanism for the program promotes non-competitive collaborative efforts of all in the sense that the development of human services activities in all university units, in other institutions, and other community programs does not compete with, but contributes to, the accomplishment of the goals of the program.

18. Program development, including program evaluation, is a continuing process upon which improved revisions of program elements are based.

19 The program provides a mechanism for the voluntary entry and exit of faculty, departments, community programs, and individuals based upon contractual agreements.

20. The program provides for changing needs of students through curriculum development as a process.

Problems Associated with the Nature of the Program

We know from the history of social programs in the United States over the past 40 years that Federal programs have not produced many impressively successful national changes in the delivery of human services. And we know from local university programs across the country that they have not been impressively successful in producing the kinds of human services professionals that can influence community change to any great degree.

From this knowledge, it would seem reasonable that human services program developers would need to think about education and service models that are quite different from traditional models. Not different just to be different but different in ways that take into account some of the problems that have prevented a greater improvement in human services education and practice. Some of these "different" practices have just been listed.

Paradoxically, it is these very differences from traditional ways of proceeding in professional education that may be expected to present problems for program developers and implementers. It may be useful to planners in the Office of Career Education to plan in advance for expected problems. Some of the very general problems associated with the nature of the program have to do with:

1. The time required of program developers to develop and maintain a minimal quality of program development;
2. The difficulty of educating other faculty and administrators to "something different;"
3. The difficulty of reversing the competitive image usually attached to new programs;
4. The necessity for full-scale developmental activities as preliminary to the implementation of programs;
5. The need for drastic curriculum revision and development;
6. The lack of professional expertise in human services;
7. The complexity of community linking procedures and the time required to maintain linkages;
8. Management and coordination of the multitude of student community activities.

4. PROBLEMS OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

The more serious constraints and problems associated with the development of education programs for human services professionals may fall into one or more of the following categories: a) Administrative leadership, b) organizational processes, or c) human and economic resources. Those who prepare proposals for education programs in human services may be expected to encounter problems in some or all of these areas as they attempt to secure organizational approval and to implement their programs. Because of the similarities between human services and career education, the problems for human services will be of special interest to career education planners and decision-makers at both Federal and local levels.

This discussion adopts the frame of reference of the planners, developers, or proposers of programs and necessarily assumes that the programs in question are of sufficient quality that they *should* be implemented. Judgments concerning quality will need to be made in terms of issues that are in the

process of being addressed at the national level. The following elaboration of the problem areas refers to experiences that one might expect in higher education. However, those who are employed in systems other than education should be able to generalize from most of these experiences to their own special circumstances.

Administrative Leadership[9]

There will, of course, be those administrators who will be helpful; but for those proposers and developers of programs who happen not to have the good fortune of administrative leadership from above them, the problems occurring from this deficiency are serious deterrents to program change. While each of the other problem areas can prevent severe handicaps to program approval and success, strong and imaginative leadership can create alternatives to such handicaps. Organizational processes, human and economic resources, and other problems can all be influenced more readily by creative leadership than program proposers can influence administrators who are not effective leaders.

More often than not, administrative deficiencies result from one or a combination of two things: a) An administrator's lack of training and expertise in contemporary concepts and practices in administration (a deficiency often arising from the promotion of people having other skills into administrative positions), and b) an administrator's personal needs. It may be helpful to list some examples of the deficiency (when it exists) in administrative leadership above the level of program proposers and implementers.

1. For the sake of personal security, unqualified administrators often build themselves a "pat" frame of reference from which they view every issue. That is, they place each issue within a previously determined set, so that any question is assumed to have the same "givens."

2. Such a simplistic conceptual base suggests simplistic questions so that the totality of an administrator's curiosity may fall within such shallow, albeit necessary, questions: "How much will it cost me?", "Where will it be housed administratively?", and "Does the program follow the traditions of the institution (so I won't have to figure out new ways of handling a situation)?".

   It is not that matters of money or practicality are unimportant; but there are other practical questions, such as "What are the qualifications of the faculty to carry out this program?", "What evidence is there that students need or want this program?", "What evidence is there that this

program would increase enrollment?", "What noticeable changes could I expect to see after 2 years?", and "How will it contribute to my own credit as an effective administrator?". (Administrators generally feel they need to pretend they have no such personal concerns about their own effectiveness, which is, of course, nonsense.)

3. The personal need to control found in some administrators has a number of concomitants. For example:

   a. They tend not to recognize or utilize fully the human resources within their organization;

   b. By rewarding "yes"–people, they tend to discourage 1) dissent or plurality, 2) open dialogue about issue, and 3) the exercise of responsibility by individuals and organizational units under their "command";

   c. They control the amount and nature of information that is available to the organization;

   d. They promote competitive rather than collaborative organizational behavior.

4. Academic rules and protocol or organizational tradition are often applied in routine, uncreative fashion. Having been stung from previous attempts to do things differently, an administrator may adhere more rigidly to "the way things have always been around here," in order to assure a smooth boatride. Business-as-usual doesn't attract the attention of critics; but something different brings the self-appointed policemen of the organization out of hiding with their arsenal of overt and covert resistances.

5. An administrator's need for personal and job security may require the perpetuation of the bureaucratic caste system. Some administrators feel they can remain "clean" in the eyes of the faculty as long as they keep the bureaucracy functioning by carefully following the rules about whom they talk to, whom they allow to talk to them, and who reports to whom according to a line-authority military protocol. Some administrators perpetuate the bureaucracy in order to prevent the faculty from appropriating power being held by the administrator.

6. The need for security may affect an administrator's functioning in many ways, another of which is the need to avoid risk. The need never to be wrong tends to result in avoiding the acceptance of responsibility or accountability. If the administrator does not risk accepting

responsibility, he can point to someone else to be accountable for mistakes and failures.

Often incompetent administrators cannot differentiate between the value of faculty responsibility and the value of their own clear responsibilities and accountability. That is, they either abnegate entirely their administrative leadership, leaving all responsibility for program development to faculty; or they assume too many responsibilities that properly should be delegated.

7. Those administrators who are not afraid to risk may err in the opposite direction by grabbing your proposal and waving it into being with a memo to the faculty: "Please be advised that as of October 13, there will be a Career Education program under the direction of Dr. X. If you have an interest in this subject, please see Dr. X." It is for this reason, and other reasons, that it is wise for program proposers to include in the proposal the proposed process for initiating the program.

8. "Problem" administrators are often certain, with no glimmer of doubt, that they already possess the basic knowledge required to understand a particular situation. The issues are assumed to be the same issues involved in every other program they have encountered over their previous years as administrators. In other words, there is no such thing to them as something different.

9. Because of this assumption, such administrators will not be curious or interested in reading or hearing information supplied by you. You cannot expect them to read anything that requires more than five minutes of concentrated attention. The consequence is that they will not have acquired the understanding necessary to assess the situation with reason and logic.

10. Administrators who do not know how to be administrators may make snap diagnoses according to a medical model or management. Such diagnoses are based more upon assumptions than upon facts, due to the administrator's unwillingness to devote minimal attention to learning the facts.

11. Having (accurately) assessed the incidence of hollow rhetoric accompanying proposals, traditional administrators may accept this reality as part of the "game" and may categorize every positive-sounding word or phrase as the usual rhetoric. For proposers of a human services program to suggest that it is "innovative", for example, is to say nothing that has meaning to university administrators who do not look into the substance of proposals.

12. Administrators who do not see the relationship of programs to the total organizational health and well-being are likely to see the proposal of a new program as "your problem", not theirs. Administrative leadership cannot be expected from administrators who are blind to the benefits (and detriments) of the various programs to the organization and to their own success as administrators. They tend to see getting "your" program as a favor to you rather than a benefit to them or to the organization.

13. Deficient middle-managers (chairpersons and deans) do not generally have the sophistication to differentiate among procedures of administration, management, supervision, and above all, *professional leadership*. Administrators who do not understand the meaning of leadership tend to polarize their options into either-or extremes. Either they must remain totally uninvolved in the development of new programs or they must be autocratic manipulators. Those who do not choose to hand down edicts from on high may accept, as their only alternative, being the helpless victims of the organizational processes which determine outcomes.

14. Ineffective administrators don't know what the outcomes of their organization or subsystem should be cecause their statements of goals and mission are regarded as rhetoric to satisfy organizational requirements and State boards of higher education.

Organizational Processes

The working processes of the organization or the way the organizational wheels go around have a considerable influence upon the success of program development and operations. A few predictable problems in this area are listed below.

1. University policies and procedures are more often obstacles than facilitating mechanisms. This is because they have a certain base of tradition, and are set up with certain assumptions about "the way things should be." When new ideas and concepts come along, they do not usually fit into the policies and procedures that have previously been determined. Another way of saying it is that university policies and procedures are set up on the basis of past experiences and existing conditions, not taking into account future possibilities for different ways of "doing business."

2. The university approval machinery exists to perpetuate and protect the bureaucracy the way it is. Programs that do not originate out of

departments or specialized units often have no place to originate. When programs such as human services and career education do, out of necessity, originate in traditional department structures, they are often controlled by that department in ways that are inappropriate to the program.

When it is manageable to get cross-departmental support for a multidisciplinary program it is still inextricably rooted in a bureaucratic departmental system. For example, the individuals proposing such a program still belong, at the proposal stage of development, to their respective departments. And they are expected to remain "loyal" to them, which means to ensure the survival, perpetuation, and enhancement of the department. It would be highly unusual for a department not to consider disloyal the removing of several of its members or personnel lines.

In those cases where such individuals are eventually based in an institute or center, that unit becomes competitive with the former departments for resources. In these times of limited resources, faculties are more aware and jealous of the use of monies which either have been taken from them or could have been added to their own budgets. And the new administrative unit to which faculty are added must take on many of the same characteristics of the bureaucracy in order to survive the organizational processes.

If such institutes or centers do not bring in credit hours, they do not, without external funding, pay their way. And if they do compete with departments for students and/or budget, they are back into the competitive bureaucratic model. There are some alternatives to this problem, one of which is the Center Model mentioned earlier.

3. The traditional organizational structure of universities promotes a bureaucratic "machine" that can only be managed according to the rules of the bureaucracy. The politics of the organization often derives from particular personalities in the higher administrative positions as well as from the tradition of years. Those proposed programs that require more contemporary organizational concepts and processes in order to succeed in today's communities are caught in the double bind of choosing between two evils—acceding to bureaucratic tradition (compromising quality) or insisting upon contemporary programs ("taking on", at almost impossible odds, the power of the bureaucracy).

4. Policies and procedures governing the operational processes present, constraints and problems that often require compromise and

changes in the goals and objectives of the proposed program. The issue of compromise is a slippery one that should not fall into either-or dichotomies. The question requires a thoughtful definition of compromise by the proposers of programs, a predetermined notion of that thin line between reasonable compromise and a contradiction of the program's purpose or spirit. Program developers would need to ask: At what point do compromised changes subvert the original idea behind the program? In the case of career education, the question might be: At what point does the program as it would be changed become something other than quality career education?

5. Bureaucracies tend not to be greatly influenced by their consumer constituencies—at least not until the consumers assume an adversary position. In our opinion, the growing consumer movement is changing all other community systems more than higher education. Even public secondary education—historically charged by society to preserve the past—is required to deal head-on with consumer constituencies today. Perhaps State legislatures are delivering messages to higher education through their budget reductions that will eventually require real internal programmatic changes; but for the time being higher education is not required in any direct way to respond to its consumers.

6. When career education programs are administered in departments that have names other than career education, they may be expected to fall below the department's major priorities. If the program brings in outside money, it is likely to be greeted as a friendly guest, but when the money goes (and continuing Federal funding is a thing of the past), career education is likely to be a stepchild instead of one of the family.

   This attitude can be reduced if the department as a whole makes the decision to prepare the program proposal, and if more than a handful of the department are committed to and involved in working in the program. But commitment elicited by money alone is short-lived and less than impressive.

7. Organizations that are rigidly compartmentalized into linear organizational charts and that deliver their services/products in strict isolation from each other see a steady stream of competitive events, all unrelated. Consequently there can be little, if any, orchestration of the program beyond the level of rhetoric. Programs that are planned in line with contemporary organizational practices must still survive within their larger bureaucratic organizational homes.

8. The university is a uniquely vested interest engaged in questionable conflicts-of-interest. It determines programmatic needs, develops programs, funds them internally (through annual budget allocations), delivers the programs, and then evaluates them. This parasitic relationship feeds a closed system of organizational processes.

Human and Economic Resources

Human resources for human services education are extremely limited for a number of reasons beyond the obvious national economic problems. First, there are few, if any, higher education programs in the country that have trained or are presently training professionals in human services as a field; consequently there are few professionals who are qualified to develop human services education programs (defined according to the contemporary human services movement).

Those programs carrying the title human services have been in reality special interest fields; e.g., social work, corrections, psychology, urban studies, counseling. Upon examining the course titles, syllabi, and bibliographies, one discovers that the subject content of such programs is really specialized training for a single field. Few professionals have had *both* community experience across systems and doctoral level training in a cross-systems human services program. It is natural that the training programs developed by field specialists would show the influence of their own single system perspective.

Recognition of the existing vacuum at the graduate level is likely to stir universities into human services education in the near future, but during the interim until graduate programs begin to offer "real" human services content, the problem of human resources will be acute. Education programs for specialized human services personnel such as career education professionals, may be a motivating force for new directions in graduate education for other specialists.

But career education has a special distinction that must be considered. Career education, like human services, is not an academic field in the traditional sense because it does not represent a single system, as most other agencies and fields do. It is this broadness of concern, crossing the entire network of the community as well as academic fields, that brings a greater opportunity to influence other fields and the community in general.

While each of the social systems (education, manpower, health, mental health, welfare, law enforcement, and others) is responding to the national trends toward recognizing the interrelationships existing among all systems, each system naturally sees itself as the center and primary focus of these

relationships. Like human services, career education is in a better position to view national and community needs without promoting a single professional field as the primary interest and central force.

Retraining of human services professionals requires certain conditions not generally existing: It requires available training programs representing contemporary human services education. It requires economic resources and support from institutions, or the ability of the institution to get along without individuals who finance their own training on leaves-of-absence. It requires an in-service training system on the university's own campus using time and competencies of its own already-trained faculty if such exists. And it may require reallocation of resources from existing programs that do not have an equally high priority in the university's mission and goals.

In these difficult economic times, all of these things make retraining in human services a problem. Only those universities that formally and publicly declare human services a high priority will be able to accomplish the introduction of quality programs. Master's-level professionals are not ordinarily available as teachers of human services in universities where organizational requirements for most teaching positions include the doctoral degree.

A third major human resources problem concerns the professional identity of university personnel who are potential trainees. People who have spent their time and money for many years in order to reach the point where they can wear the label, professional "X", and can qualify for professional jobs in their specialization are not eager to "start over" in a new field. One's ego does not easily accept the possibility that his professional preparation may have been inadequate. Having achieved the pinnacle, we do not ordinarily want to place ourselves at the bottom of another ladder and become a student again. Personal identity as a professional, especially in universities, accustoms us to teaching others what we know, and the humble label of student can reduce the ego-rewards of being "at the top" of the knowledge ladder. Most readers have experienced—if not in themselves, in others—the Professor-Doctor syndrome where having the title supercedes any and all other criteria for professional competence.

Associated with such ego problems are job-related practical problems for university professors. The bureaucratic systems of universities generally follow the traditional departmental organization, even when departments are called "faculties" or "divisions." The individual's reward system is tied to his organizational home where recommendations for promotions, tenure, and salary increases originate. Even when organizational structures permit transferring to a human services "home," professionals do not lightly give up their colleagues and the security they have finally achieved in their professional homes.

Becoming a human services professional is more risky than becoming a professional in other academic disciplines, for other disciplines are already established with history, tradition, and academic respect that does not have to be won. It is even less enticing to flirt with human services when it has no organizational home, for one can be regarded within his own department as a traitor. And most professionals know this.

In-service education programs for on-the-job human services professionals, when offered by universities, are generally quite similar, if not identical, to the campus programs in terms of content. When in-service education is provided by the agency of employment, it is almost never offered in collaboration with other systems and represents subject matter related only to the particular system of employment, not to human services as a generalist field.

The constraints to human services education attributable to economic austerity are known to everyone and require little comment. While there may be better opportunities for external funding for human services education than for most single academic fields, those opportunities can not be realized without human resources and time. In order to receive external funding the university must provide 1) qualified "human servicers" and 2) the time to develop quality proposals. The Federal funding route is no longer the routine answer to economic resources in most human service systems and it presents a special problem for graduate human services education programs.

Effective human services program development in higher education is significantly different from program development in a single or multidisciplinary field. Human services is a new professional field and *program* development requires simultaneous development of the *field*. The fields of social work, corrections, counseling, psychology, and the like are already-developed fields, having reasonably long-existing organizational homes. Traditional grant writings can occur while one sits comfortably in his "home", confident in the knowledge that his work brings with it rewards from his department.

Grant writing in a new field has no such luxury. Grant writing in an existing academic field is built upon a professional subject matter that has, for the most part, already been developed nationally as well as in the university. The subject matter is familiar and accepted in the organization. One does not have to sell psychology to the university at the same time that he writes a proposal in some area of psychology. He has only to sell the particular aspect of psychology.

It is not so easy in human services. And the same will be true for career education since it has not been an academic professional field in graduate education. This is another reason why career education and human services can

be good bedfellows in their efforts to build new educational programs for professionals.

Without external funding and sufficient dollars allocated by State legislatures, universities must look to reallocation of existing monies. Such a task sounds easier than it is. Most budgets are locked in to fixed personnel lines (and, as we have said earlier, most faculties are not eager to learn anything new). In order to reallocate in a rational manner, universities will be forced to specify their priorities in much more specific terms than they have had to in the past.

Historically, a university could state its priorities in quite general terms, allowing for support and happiness from all quarters within the organization. Budgets have been decided in the "back room" without the necessity of public accounting to the faculty. (Faculties themselves, who are not known for their information-sharing tendencies, have unwittingly protected the administration's secrecy.) In these days, when an organization places Department "X" as number 20 in a list of priorities, Department "X" is no longer purring content, and it creates problems for administrators. Even being number 20 on a list is not quite so hard to swallow as having a specific amount of dollars withdrawn from a budget already seen by the department as barebones.

When departments have been created to house programs, the phasing-out of programs often means the loss of an entire department. The loss of departments means the university must either terminate faculty or reassign them to other units. In the university culture of specialization, reassignment is analogous to sending an Eskimo whaler to be president of General Motors, or vice-versa. Reassignment of faculty requires retraining and we have already discussed those problems as they relate to human services.

In a competitive environment like the university, there are not many departments that volunteer for extinction. And when unilateral decisions are made by higher administrators, disgruntled faculty cry foul. For some reason, faculty seem not to object to the "fat" at higher administrative levels as much as to inequities among faculties. Perhaps it is the paternal tradition of bureaucracies that makes it acceptable for Daddy to say no and that keeps sibling rivalry prosperous.

Another problem associated with reallocation concerns the student constituencies who are beginning, albeit slowly, to recognize that they, too, are consumers just like "real" community citizens. Dropping a program or half its staff does not always sit well with the students who were depending upon that program for their own professional preparation.

The human services Organic Model presents a reasonable alternative to such obstacles to program development. Following such a model could provide a vehicle for economic survival of certain departments through imaginative linking and consortia with community systems.

5. CONCEPTS OF PREVENTION IN PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Both *prevention* and *program development* were included as content areas described in Section 3. Because the development of education programs for human services personnel is itself a human services activity, many of the human services concepts to be learned in the education curriculum are, of course, applicable and useful to developers of training programs.

The concept of prevention is familiar in the professional literature of public health, community mental health, law enforcement and corrections, and education. In this section, we have suggested a few general concepts of program development that may help to 1) avert the occurrence of many problems (primary prevention), 2) reduce the seriousness and duration of those problems that do occur (secondary prevention), and 3) minimize the aftereffects and secondary consequences of problems (tertiary prevention).

Given the previously described problems that program developers may encounter, we suggest some preventive actions that are applicable to most university settings. They evolve from a simple combination of primary prevention, program development, and organizational development (a third human services content area), and are intended merely as representative examples of prevention in program development.

1. *Program Development Model or Plan.*—The single most important preventive concept for program developers to take into account is the necessity for creating, even before the program proposal is written, a model or plan for the process of program development. Such a model would set forth the plan of operation to be followed in the process of program development. The success of any program depends largely upon the professional quality of the program development process before the program begins.

2. *Developmental Stages.*—Many problems can be circumvented if the major decision points in program development define the boundaries of developmental stages *within* a continuing process rather than denote incidents in an undifferentiated process. For example, the program development team may identify certain actions and conditions that comprise the first stage of development; and the actual writing of the proposal may not occur until the second stage (after the necessary

conditions have been met and preliminary actions taken). Those who follow this concept will prevent the well-known "wasted" efforts of so many program proposers who devote time and efforts to the writing of a proposal that they discover only after-the-fact was intended to gather dust in the bottom drawer of an administrator's desk, or was intended to be one of several competing proposals with which they would not have chosen to compete. If program developers discover in advance these and other realities, they have the opportunity to decide to spend their energies on other things that have a better chance to succeed.

3. *Open Options and Contingency Plans.*—Program developers should build in to their model a continuing system of open options and contingency plans. For example, should your efforts to "sell" a new program direction to the university be unsuccessful or should your contribution become adulterated along the way, your program development team may decide at any stage in the process that program development should not continue to go forward until the necessary conditions are met. Such conditions are those basic requirements that would be set forth in the program development model.

4. *Public Sanction and Support.*—The proposed development model should be put in writing, should be agreed upon by each member of the team, and should be the basis of a written request of the appropriate administrator for his *written* and public approval of the process you propose to follow. Even when university approval mechanisms are primarily faculty processes, it is still essential to formalize sanction and support from the appropriate administrators at various stages of development.

As we have indicated earlier, many administrators have a set position of neutrality (bordering on disinterest) with regard to program development. While there can be advantages in being free from an administrator's *control*, it is no advantage to have the major administrator completely uninvolved and unconcerned. An administrator who has "bought in" (participated in formal negotiations) to the program development plan and who has a vested interest in its eventual success, is likely to exercise some leadership on behalf of the program.

Program developers who are willing to play the game under risk-free administration should not be surprised if the administrator "bails out" on program development after the program planners have already contributed their time, energies, and expertise well beyond their job descriptions, or after the organization already "owns" some of the products of the program developers (e.g., new curriculum). But public sanction and support are likely to reduce casual and irresponsible "changes of heart."

5. *Commitment of Organizational Units.*—The organizational home of the program should be expected to declare career education (or human services) a priority and should provide appropriate support of its chosen priority. Departments or units that derive benefits of enrollment, curriculum development, and other rewards of program development should make a public commitment to your efforts. Under no circumstances should program developers allow their departments to "have it both ways:" To enjoy the benefits without appropriately rewarding the program developers for their efforts.

6. *Control of the Development Process.*—The authors of an idea must be ready to exercise their freedom to "stop." It is the inability to say no that we feel creates, by default, so many bastardized programs in higher education. If you are to be held accountable, either officially or informally, for the success or failure of the proposal and/or its implementation, you must not allow the quality and nature of the program or the proposal to be under the control of others who are free from accountability. If you work within a framework of open options, you have the option of withdrawing your contribution (program development) to the organization until the process of development is under the control of those who are both qualified and accountable.

   The determination of faculty subgroups to retain control over the quality of programs for which they are responsible is often regarded in the university community as presumptuous and arrogant. Breakers of tradition are in vulnerable positions within their academic communities, but accepters of tradition are equally vulnerable if they compromise their professional integrity by silently condoning inferior programs.

7. *Theft-proof Development.*—Program developers have a professional responsibility to ensure that their scholarship and expertise will not be appropriated by unqualified units or individuals for academically or professionally inappropriate purposes. In the vested interest, turf-bound system of university bureaucracies, it is not unusual for curriculum development, program concepts, or the scholarly work of program developers to be used and compromised by others in business-as-usual operations. Student consumers are entitled to some protection of the quality of their educational programs.

8. *Open Communication.*—Program developers do not need to participate in secret, under the table, back-room politics even when they are the accepted culture of the organization. Free and open access to information in the process of program development is an advantage to the program. Memoranda recording major decisions and developments (with copies to

all appropriate persons) help to keep the process public and the actors accountable.

9. *Early Participation and Linking System.*—It is important to involve the appropriate faculty and staff, as well as consumers and community agency personnel, early in the process of program development. The program development model should include a system of linking all participants in program development.

10. *A Program Development Mechanism.*—Program developers should "educate" their organizations by *practicing* a more contemporary model of program development. There is a recognizable pattern of higher administration in many universities that deals with problems and programs as if they were a series of unrelated events rather than a part of a single environmental process. The university, we feel, does not need a continuation of fragmented, unrelated new-program proposals. What universities need is *a system of change*—a system that conceptualizes change as a process rather than a series of disparate events.

    We believe universities should be given a *mechanism for development* that will provide a sound base of operation for future activities relating to human services. Such a mechanism could also serve as a model for university development in other areas according to a general ecological framework. The system of change that has guided our work has been the Organic Model.[10]

11. *Program Evaluation.*—The program evaluation plan should be an integral part of the program development model rather than an "afterthought" activity added to the proposal. In other words, program evaluation and program development are best carried out as parts of the same process.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NATIONAL PLANNING

It was stated earlier that career education has the option of using a) programs that are an integral part of human services programs, and/or b) programs of career education that include human services components. The subject needs to be studied and considered by career education professionals but it may be helpful to mention a few advantages of each that appear at first glance.

Some advantages of utilizing broader human services programs are:

1. This contemporary movement is in line with the general direction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as indicated by former Secretary Richardson and by recent statements of the present Secretary Mathews.

2. It would be ultimately less costly to HEW in terms of both Federal and State dollars, and less costly to local institutions.

3. The heterogeneity of the student constituency would broaden the perspective of career education professionals-to-be.

4. Such programs could be a vehicle for intersystems collaboration at the Federal level. Career education could be a leader in the implementation of intragovernmental coordination held in high priority by HEW.

5. This option helps to avoid the oversupply of manpower by preparing professionals whose specialization provides for mobility across jobs, across systems, and across communities.

Some advantages of the second option are:

1. New career education training could begin sooner if programs are managed as strictly career education. (There are few, if any, existing programs in human services today that would be available as appropriate vehicles.)

2. Career education would have a more direct influence upon and control over the nature and quality of programs if Federal dollars are used for career education–only programs.

3. Sooner outcomes could be expected.

4. Career education–only programs would be more immediately manageable at Federal, State, and local levels.

We have limited our recommendations to the areas of general planning because it seems more appropriate that the details of planning should be considered as a part of a second process in which professional career education specialists would be the primary movers. We hope they will be influenced in

their final decisions by the ideas set forth in this monograph. The following suggestions, then, are general in nature.

1. A thorough and thoughtful consideration of the scope of career educator training requires that we think beyond the education of only career education personnel to the need for the education of others upon whom the success of career education demands.

   Decision-makers in higher administrative positions have a tremendous influence upon the success or failure of both education/training programs of personnel at local levels and also career education service programs where they are delivered. Administrator/decision-makers who do not understand the basic concepts underlying career education or the place of career education in human services can do more, intentionally or unintentionally, to prevent the success of career education as a national movement than most of us suspect. It is for this reason that we believe it is important for career education at the national level to plan specifically and to solicit ideas for models or ways of educating this important group.

   Another important group that influences the success or failure of (quality) programs is the support personnel who are not assigned directly to career education but who are expected to incorporate career education practices into their own job roles. This would include faculties in educational institutions and all kinds of human services personnel in other community systems.

   Two other groups are a) those personnel other than career education specialists who will be *doing* "front-line" career education, and b) the consumers of career education—the obvious recipients of career education.

2. At all levels of career education, there is an imperative need to include consideration and participation of the *consumers* of career education. There are, of course, many kinds and levels of consumers: a) The ultimate person to whom career education is delivered (in schools, this would be students; in business it would be employees or trainees; in community agencies, the recipients of services); b) the potential career educator; c) parents of career educatees; d) administrators and staff of all community systems; e) legislators; f) citizens in general.

   The juggling act is to take all of these consumers into account without subverting or compromising the primary purpose of help as the major focus. But there has been a most serious neglect, we believe, in the absence of consumer participation in both the development and delivery of career

education. The implication—"they don't know what they need"—would be damaging to the future of career education.

3. The traditional goal of the helping professions has been standardization of professional education programs in order to ensure quality—quality being equated with standardization. But when the goal is for all programs to look alike there is good reason to doubt whether quality education is being delivered to each of the different consumer constituencies who have different needs, different educational backgrounds, and different employment experiences.

   Quality may have to be defined differently. Perhaps the minimal qualifications specified for education programs should not be content areas as much as other characteristics. For example: a) Evidence of the adaptation of education programs to consumer and community needs, b) built-in mechanisms for continuing change instead of eternal vigilence against the changing nature of programs usually prescribed by the professions, and c) more emphasis upon the qualifications of the *personnel* who deliver the programs.

4. At the Federal level, the Office of Career Education could enter into its criteria for awarding grants, specific requirements concerning university training programs (when they are related to the proposals under consideration). Such requirements would either force university programs into more contemporary directions or reward and support those non-university programs that do comply with the higher standards—the latter being merely an indirect influence upon university change.

5. The same general considerations could be included in requirements for Federal monies which go to State and local education agencies for new programs. A necessary condition for their utilizing university curriculum, workshops, or program evaluation might be that these systems "encourage" change in university programs through their own pre-conditions.

6. Some portion of Federal monies could be provided for demonstration programs that have shown evidence of the contemporary utilization of human services and/or career education concepts and practices. This funding could be available for university and/or non-university programs.

7. Some portion of Federal monies could be provided directly to community systems, if this is possible, for education and training proposals that include evidence of *prior* utilization of human services and/or career education principles. Evidence would be provided that a) commitment preceded the request for money and b) career education was delivered

without Federal funds. Such funds would be incentive funds more than support funds.

8. Some portion of career education monies could support the *collaborative* development of education programs of career education personnel by universities or non-university groups with community systems. Such proposals would presuppose the existence of some kind of human services collaborative mechanism or organizational unit as opposed to the traditional committees, task forces, and advisory councils.

9. While such directions as those listed above would need to be developed more specifically, it would also be important to leave the door open for new and original ideas that would accompany proposals. That is, the requirements and criteria should not be so specific that they prevent other possibly superior criteria from being generated. (Guideline criteria for the rating of proposals should not add up to 100 percent, but should leave some portion of the scale for new criteria that can be added by the rater.)

10. The Office of Career Education should look into the possibility of exercising leadership in a number of human services efforts that would integrate and coordinate some of the most obviously interrelated activities occurring within HEW and also between HEW and other Government departments. It would seem reasonable to assume, from Secretary Mathews' statements, that the Secretary's Office would be seeking this kind of inter-system coordination and would lend assistance toward this end. Just a few examples of such possibilities are:

    a. OCE could encourage the potential interfaces that would make it possible for *Federal and State legislation* to benefit from the coordination and integration of the efforts of those who have interrelated interests and purposes. Operationally this would mean more than presently existing inter-agency activities. It would mean that input into the legislative processes might be broadened to include those systems and organizations, both within and outside Government offices, that have a legitimate contribution to make.

    Such efforts could occur in relation to a) influencing the content of new legislation before the stage of formal deliberation, b) improving legislation through input into amendments to existing legislation, and c) contributing to the effective implementation of legislation through input to the offices that administer programs. Examples of such legislation are: (Coming out of HEW), the National Health Planning and Resource Development Act, the Health Maintenance Organizations Act, and the proposed Allied Services Act, and (coming out of other

departments), the Housing and Community Development Act and the Comprehensive Employment And Training Act.

In return, specific career education legislation would benefit from coordination with such sources as the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, Title XX of the Social Security Act, and the 1975 Amendments to the Community Mental Health Centers Act. Obviously these legislative examples can be utilized for the process of influencing program in both directions and in all possible combinations.

b. OCE could take steps to make input into organizations and/or their divisions or subsystems which have not been a traditional part of the career education "network"; e.g., the American Society of Public Administration, the National Council of Community Mental Health Centers, American Orthopsychiatric Association, Princeton University's Business Today student program, and the American Public Health Association, whose 1975 annual convention theme, it is interesting to note, was "Health and Work in America."

c. OCE could take steps to develop the mutual human services potential which has been documented in the special task force report, *Work in America*[11] and in *The Boundless Resource*[12] of the National Manpower Institute.

The recommendations for national planning, in order to be both contemporary and futuristic, must be considered a) in the larger context of national directions for comprehensive and integrated human services networks, and b) with more realistic thinking regarding help-giving itself.

The individual is both a human resource and a person with human needs and wants. Society and its communities represent the same duality. In their organized systems and networks they deliver services; but society, too, has collective needs. In the organic relationship between individuals and society (their organized collective), each provides resources for the needs of the other. All of this is occurring within the context of people's personal concerns about "work," "labor," "leisure," "boredom," "recreation," "retirement," "living," and "dying," as well as desires for "fun," "productivity," "relevance," and "meaning."[13]

In their interfacing relationship, education, training, and career education will need to address both the historical issues of the work ethic and the contemporary and future issues suggested by the Lordstown syndrome. The human services directions of the 70's and 80's[14] provide a context within which career education can evolve as they both confront the very nature of life itself. The Hoyts, Marlands, Bells, Richardsons, and Wirtzes have provided us with a sound beginning upon which to build.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Hoyt, K. and Hebeller, J. *Career Education for Gifted and Talented Students.* Salt Lake City: Olympus Publishing Co., 1974.

[2]Chenault, J. *Career Education and Human Services.* Washington, D.C.: Office of Education; DHEW; 1975 (ED-109-507). pp. 23 [Cost for a microfiche reproduction: 76 cents plus 18 cents postage. Cost for a full-size hard-copy reproduction: $1.95 plus 18 cents postage.]

[3]Chenault, J. *Human Services Education and Practice: An Organic Model.* New York: Behavioral Publications, 1975. pp. 69.

[4]The authors wish to acknowledge the help and influence of Dr. Terrence M. Rohen as the third team member in the development and implementation of the SIU-E program model.

[5]This system was devised and organized by two human services graduate students, Morris Miller and Don Souther, and later refined by James Leary and Pat Talley as part of their work experience. This mechanism does not follow the classical "knocking on doors" in the community to secure placement for student experience.

[6]Chenault, op. cit.

[7]Chenault, op. cit.

[8]This classification is an arbitrary separation of subject matter and as unrealistic as any other classification of human services content. One cannot learn about crisis intervention, for example, apart from support systems, about program evaluation apart from program development, about prevention apart from community mental health, about citizen action apart from community organization. The interrelationships among all areas are obviously close and complex, making it important that no content be taught as an isolated course apart from others.

[9]Some of the administrative and organizational issues described in this section have been discussed from other perspectives in: Broskowski, A., Mermis, W., and Khajavi, F. Managing the Dynamics of Change and Stability. *Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators.* La Jolla, Calif.: University Associates, 1975, 173-177; and in Hirschowitz, R. Patterns of Change. *Mental Hygiene,* 1974, *58*, 33-35.

[10]Chenault, op. cit.

[11]O'Toole, J. (Ed.) and Chairman, Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. *Work in America.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1973.

[12]Wirtz, W. *The Boundless Resource.* Washington, D.C.: New Republic Book Co., 1975.

[13]Dunnette, M. (Ed.) *Work and Nonwork in the Year 2001.* Monterey, Calif.: Brooks-Cole Pub., 1973; Haun, P. *Recreation: A Medical Viewpoint.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1965; Hoyt, K. *An Introduction to Career Education.* Position Paper, Office of Career Education, U.S. DHEW. Govt. Printing Office (OE 75-00504); Levitan, S. *Work is Here to Stay, Alas.* Salt Lake City: Olympus Pub. Co., 1973; O'Toole, J., op. cit.; Sheppard, H. and Herrick, N. *Where Have All the Robots Gone? Worker Dissatisfaction in the 70's.* New York: The Free Press, 1972; Wirtz, W., op. cit.

[14]Demone, H., and Schulberg, H. Human Services Trends in the Mid-1970's. *Social Case work,* 1975, *56,* 268-279; Baker, F. From Community Mental Health to Human Services Ideology. *Amer. J. of Public Health,* 1974, *64,* 576-581.

HE 008 574

GPO 902-427